



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,028	08/27/2003	Hirotsugu Terada	450100-04702	5117

7590 11/27/2006

William S. Frommer, Esq.
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10151

EXAMINER

KHAN, USMAN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/649,028	Applicant(s) TERADA, HIROTSUGU	
	Examiner Usman Khan	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

Figures 9 and 10 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objection

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 7 "third detection means" should be changed to "second detection means" in accordance with the independent claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 2 and 8 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.: 102(b) as being anticipated by applicants admitted prior art.

Regarding **claim 1**, the applicant admits in figure 9 and 10 that it is conventional to have a optical system controller for a video camera, comprising: a lens barrel (figure 9) having therein a movable optical system including a zooming lens, a focusing lens, and an iris diaphragm (figure 9; it is inherent that the zoom control 15, focus control 14, and diaphragm/aperture control 16 has associated with it zooming lens, a focusing lens, and an iris diaphragm); movable mechanisms for focusing control, zooming control, and aperture control, said movable mechanisms being arranged around the lens barrel (figure 9; zoom control 15, focus control 14, and diaphragm/aperture control 16); a control means that controls the driving of said movable mechanisms for focusing control, zooming control, and aperture control (figure 9; zoom control 15, focus control 14, and diaphragm/aperture control 16); a first, second, and third optical display means that are arranged near said movable mechanisms for focusing control, zooming control, and aperture control which are arranged around the lens barrel (figure 9: zoom control

Art Unit: 2622

15, focus control 14, and diaphragm/aperture control 16; figure 10: zoom display 17, focus control 19, and diaphragm/aperture control 19; the examiner is taking near as meaning "not far distant in time or space or degree or circumstances" in turn the display of figure 10 is near the barrel which comprise the movable mechanisms of figure 9); a first, second, and third detecting means to detect respectively the position of said focusing lens, the position of said zooming lens, and the opening of said iris diaphragm which change in the lens barrel (it is inherent that the zoom, focus and iris position are detected by some detecting means); a first display control means that causes said first optical display means to make a display in response to the position of the focusing lens which has been detected by said first detecting means (figure 10 item 18); a second display control means that causes said second optical display means to make a display in response to the position of the zooming lens which has been detected by said second detecting means (figure 10 item 17); and a third display control means that causes said third optical display means to make a display in response to the opening of the iris diaphragm which has been detected by said third detecting means (figure 10 item 19).

Regarding **claim 2**, the applicant admits in figure 9 and 10 that it is conventional to have the optical system controller for a video camera as defined in Claim 1, wherein the first optical display means is arranged in the vicinity of the focus adjusting movable mechanism (figures 9 and 10), the second optical display means is arranged in the vicinity of the zoom adjusting movable mechanism (figures 9 and 10), and the third

optical display means is arranged in the vicinity of the aperture adjusting movable mechanism (figures 9 and 10).

Regarding **claim 8**, the applicant admits in figure 9 and 10 that it is conventional to have the optical system controller for a video camera as defined in Claim 1, wherein the drive control means includes a first optical drive means which moves the zoom lens in the direction of the optical axis in response to the action of the zoom adjusting movable mechanism or the zoom adjusting control signal from outside (figure 9 and 10), a second optical drive means which drives the iris diaphragm in response to the action of the aperture adjusting movable mechanism or the aperture control signal from outside (figure 9 and 10), and a third optical drive means which moves the focus lens in the direction of the optical axis in response to the action of the focus adjusting movable mechanism or the focus adjusting control signal from outside (figure 9 and 10).

Regarding **claim 9**, the applicant admits in figure 9 and 10 that it is conventional to have the optical system controller for a video camera as defined in Claim 1, wherein the first, second, and third detection means issue respectively the first detection output signal which denotes the position of the focus lens (figure 9 and 10 item 18), the second detection output signal which denotes the position of the zoom lens (figure 9 and 10 item 17), and the third detection output signal which denotes the opening of the iris diaphragm (figure 9 and 10 item 19), and further the first display control means actuates the first optical display means in response to the first detection output signal (figure 9

and 10 item 18), the second display control means actuates the second optical display means in response to the second detection output signal (figure 9 and 10 item 17), and the third display control means actuates the third optical display means in response to the third detection output signal (figure 9 and 10 item 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by applicants admitted prior art in further view of Examiners Official Notice.

Regarding **claim 4**, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 1, applicants admitted prior art teaches all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, applicants admitted prior art fails to disclose that each of the first, second, and third optical display means makes a display by emitting color light. The examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to use a plurality of color light in camera displays.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a plurality of color lights in the camera displays with the teachings of applicants admitted prior art as doing this would render the display easier to decipher by the user.

Claims 5 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by applicants admitted prior art in further view of Mizumura (US patent No. 6,526,232) and in further view of Examiners Official Notice.

Regarding **claim 5**, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 4, applicants admitted prior art in view of examiners official notice teaches all of the limitations of the parent claim. However, applicants admitted prior art in view of examiners official notice fails to disclose that each of the first, second, and third optical display means is composed of a plurality of light-emitting elements arranged in array. Mizumura, on the other hand teaches that each of the first, second, and third optical display means is composed of a plurality of light-emitting elements arranged in array.

More specifically, Mizumura teaches in figure 7 that the each of the first, second, and third optical display means is composed of a plurality of light-emitting elements (the monitor of either a LCD which uses a pixel of light emitting pixels or CRT which uses phosphor to create light emitting elements has a plurality of colors) arranged in array (figure 7 items 212, 214, and 216).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate the teachings of Mizumura with the teachings of applicants admitted prior art because the use of a display using position bars as shown in Mizumura's results in easier view of the lens positions.

Regarding **claim 6**, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 5, applicants admitted prior art in view of Mizumura and in view of examiners official notice teaches all of the limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Mizumura teaches that each of the first, second, and third optical display means excites part of the light-emitting elements at a specific position which varies depending on the focus lens position detected by the first detection means, the zoom lens position detected by the third detection means, and the aperture opening detected by the third detection means (figure 7 items 212, 214, and 216).

Regarding **claim 7**, as mentioned above in the discussion of claim 6, applicants admitted prior art in view of Mizumura and in view of examiners official notice teaches all of the limitations of the parent claim. Additionally, Mizumura teaches that each of the first, second, and third optical display means excites the light-emitting elements (figure 7 items 212, 214, and 216). Additionally, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to change the color of a bar display near its extremes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a display bar which changes its color near its extremes in the camera display as doing this would enable the bar of Mizumura to have a portion of the bar change color as the bar approaches some limit; for example max zoom or min zoom, etc, thereby making the display easier to decipher by the user.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter for **claim 3**: The aperture adjusting movable mechanism is arranged along a ring encircling the outer surface of the lens barrel, and further the first optical display means is arranged along said focus adjusting movable mechanism, the second optical display means is arranged along said zoom adjusting mechanism, and the third optical display means is arranged along said aperture adjusting movable mechanism is not discussed or suggested in any of the prior art that was searched.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ohkawara (PgPub No. 2002/0154241) discloses focus, zoom, and iris drive with a display unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usman Khan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1131. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thru 6:45-4:15; Fri 6:45-3:15 or Alt. Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Usman Khan
11/20/2006
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2622



DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER